

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-7, 10-15, 18-24 and 28-30 are pending in the present application. By this response, claim 1, 4, 5, 11, 13, 19, 20, 22, and 23 are amended; claims 8, 9, 16, 17, 25, and 26 are canceled; and claim 28-30 are added. Claims 1, 11 and 19 are amended to incorporate the subject matter of claims 8, 9, 16, 17, 25 and 26. Claim 4 is amended to recite "wherein the services are the services the wireless user has subscribed to receive." Support for this amendment may be found at least on page 8, line 25, to page 9, line 5 of the present specification. Claims 5, 13, and 22 are amended to recite "wherein the associated address is a geographic location of the facility and wherein determining if the last reported location of the wireless telephone device coincides with the geographical location of the facility with which the wireless telephone unit is associated." Support for these amendments may be found at least on page 16, lines 20-31. Claims 20 and 23 are amended in view of the amendments to claim 19. Reconsideration of the claims in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

#### **I. Examiner Interview**

Applicants thank Examiner Chow for the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative during the August 10, 2005 telephone interview. During the interview, the differences between the prior art and the presently claimed invention were discussed. Examiner Chow stated he would consider the arguments presented by the Applicant. The substance of the interview is summarized in the remarks of sections that follow.

#### **II. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Alleged Anticipation, Claims 1-4, 6-7, 11-12, 14-15, 19-21 and 23-24**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 6-7, 11-12, 14-15, 19-21 and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Torrey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,466,799 B1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As to claims 1, 11 and 19, the Office Action states:

For claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 19, 20, Torrey et al teach on column 2 line 12 to column 3 line 4, converting incoming call signals received at the hand-held wireless device into signals for the wireline telephone devices by the communication premises station system without routing the call through a wired telephone network external to the facility.

Office Action dated May 20, 2005, page 3.

Claim 1, which is representative of the other rejected independent claims 11 and 19 with regard to similarly recited subject matter, reads as follows:

1. A method of routing calls to wired telephone devices in a facility, comprising:
  - receiving a call directly from a wireless network;
  - converting the call to a wired telephone network format;
  - forwarding the call to a wired telephone device without routing the call through a wired telephone network external to the facility;
  - determining a location of a wireless telephone device associated with the facility; and
  - routing the call to the wireless telephone device based on the location of the wireless telephone device, wherein the call is routed to the wireless telephone device only when the location of the wireless telephone device is not a location within the facility.

Claims 1, 11 and 19 have been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 8 and thus the following arguments are directed toward the combination of Torrey and the Examiner's Official Notice. Applicants respectfully submit that Torrey and the Official Notice, taken alone or in combination fail to teach or suggest determining a location of a wireless telephone device associated with the facility and routing the call to the wireless telephone device based on the location of the wireless telephone device, wherein the call is routed to the wireless telephone device only when the location of the wireless telephone device is not a location within the facility.

Torrey is directed to allowing a consumer to place wireless calls over their hand-held wireless communications device from telephones connected through-out their location, while keeping the convenience and flexibility of a hand-held communications device. In the Torrey system there is a communications premises station system for receiving a hand-held wireless communications device which communicates with a wireless network and has a premises station interface. The communications premises

station system has one or more telephonic interfaces for communicating with one or more telephonic devices (e.g., telephones, facsimile machines, computers). When the hand-held wireless communications device is placed in premises station (similar to a battery charger cradle), the hand-held wireless communications device electrically connects to communications premises station system.

The Office Action acknowledges that Torrey does not teach determining a location of a wireless phone and routing the call to the wireless phone. However, the Office Action takes Office Notice that a wireless communication network determines the mobile unit location by consulting either Home Register Location or Visiting Location Register before routing the call to the mobile unit is old and well known to one skilled in the art.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Official Notice presented in the Office Action. While the elements described in the Office Action may be well known at the time of the invention, Applicants are determining a location of a wireless telephone device associated with the facility; and routing the call to the wireless telephone device based on the location of the wireless telephone device, wherein the call is routed to the wireless telephone device only when the location of the wireless telephone device is not a location within the facility. The Official Notice does not address any association of a wireless phone with a particular facility, nor does the Official Notice address routing a call to a wireless device based upon the location that has previously been determined only when the location of the wireless telephone device is not a location within the facility. Applicants respectfully submit that it would not have been obvious to combine these well known elements with the teachings of Torrey. That is, Torrey does not teach or suggest determining a location of a wireless telephone device associated with the facility and routing the call to the wireless telephone device based on the location of the wireless telephone device, wherein the call is routed to the wireless telephone device only when the location of the wireless telephone device is not a location within the facility.

Furthermore, there is not so much as a suggestion in the Torrey reference to modify the reference to include such features. That is, there is no teaching or suggestion in Torrey that a problem exists for which determining a location of a wireless telephone device associated with the facility and routing the call to the wireless telephone device

based on the location of the wireless telephone device, wherein the call is routed to the wireless telephone device only when the location of the wireless telephone device is not a location within the facility, are a solution. To the contrary, Torrey only teaches communicating with devices that are electrically connected to communications premises station system. Torrey does not recognize a need to perform the features, or similar features, as recited in claims 1, 11, and 19.

Moreover, neither Torrey nor the Official Notice teaches or suggests the desirability of incorporating the subject matter of the other. That is, there is no motivation offered in either the reference or the Official Notice for the alleged combination. The Office Action alleges that the motivation for the combination is "such that the modified system of Torrey et al would be able to support the system users' conveniences of routing a call to a wireless telephone device by determining the device location first." The Torrey reference does not need to determine a location of a wireless telephone device associated with the facility first as it only uses devices electrically connected to a communication premise station system. Thus, the only teaching or suggestion to even attempt the alleged combination is based on a prior knowledge of Applicants' claimed invention thereby constituting impermissible hindsight reconstruction using Applicants' own disclosure as a guide.

One of ordinary skill in the art, being presented only with Torrey and the Official Notice, and without having a prior knowledge of Applicants' claimed invention, would not have found it obvious to combine and modify Torrey and Official Notice to arrive at Applicants' claimed invention. To the contrary, even if one were somehow motivated to combine Torrey and Official Notice, and it were somehow possible to combine the two systems, the result would not be the invention, as recited in claims 1, 11, and 19. The result would be removing an entire user environment using a well known element.

Thus, Torrey along with the Official Notice, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the features in independent claims 1, 11, and 19. At least by virtue of their dependency on claims 1, 11, and 19, the specific features of claims 2-4, 6, 7, 12, 14, 15, 20, 21, 23, and 24 are not taught or suggested by Torrey along with the Official Notice, either alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request

withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-7, 11-12, 14-15, 19-21 and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 or 103.

Moreover, in addition to their dependency from independent claim 1, the specific features recited in dependent claim 4 are not taught or suggested by Torrey. That is, Torrey does not teach or suggest wherein the services are the services the wireless user has subscribed to receive. Nowhere in the Torrey reference is there a mention of the service that is to be provided by Torrey being part of a subscription of the wireless user.

Thus, in addition to being dependent on independent claim 1, the specific features of dependent claim 4 is also distinguishable over Torrey by virtue of the specific features recited in this claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 or 103.

### **III. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Alleged Obviousness, Claims 5, 10, 13, 18 and 22**

The Office Action rejects claims 5, 10, 13, 18, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Torrey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,466,799 B1) as applied to claim 1 above, and in view of Pinard et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,454,032). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 5, 10, 13, 18 and 22 are dependent on independent claims 1, 11, and 19 and, thus, these claims distinguish over Torrey for at least the reasons noted above with regards to claims 1, 11, and 19. Moreover, Pinard does not provide for the deficiencies of Torrey and, thus, any alleged combination of Torrey and Pinard would not be sufficient to reject independent claims 1, 11, and 19 or claims 5, 10, 13, 18 and 22 by virtue of their dependency. That is, Pinard does not teach or suggest determining a location of a wireless telephone device associated with the facility and routing the call to the wireless telephone device based on the location of the wireless telephone device.

Moreover, in addition to their dependency from independent claims 1, 11, and 19, the specific features recited in dependent claims 5, 10, 13, 18 and 22 are not taught or suggested by Torrey and Pinard, either alone or in combination. With regard to claims 5, 13, and 22, Torrey and Pinard, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest wherein the associated address is a geographic location of the facility and wherein

determining if the last reported location of the wireless telephone device coincides with the geographical location of the facility with which the wireless telephone unit is associated. Neither the Torrey reference nor the Pinard reference even mentions geographic location. Neither reference mentions associating an address with a geographic location. Thus, any alleged combination of Pinard with Torreystill would not result in the invention recited in claims 5, 13, and 22.

#### IV. New Claims

Claims 28-30 are added to the pending application. The features in these claims are supported in the specification at least on page 13, line 16, to page 15, line 9 and Figure 4. Consequently, no new matter is added.

Claim 28, which is representative of the other new claims 29, and 30 with regard to similarly recited subject matter, reads as follows:

28. The method of claim 1, further comprising:  
determining when to route the calls to the wired or wireless  
telephones associated with the facility; and  
routing the call based upon the determination.

As discussed above, Torrey and the Official Notice, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest determining when to route the calls to the wired or wireless telephones associated with the facility; and routing the call based upon the determination.

**V. Conclusion**

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the prior art of record and is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephonic conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

DATE: August 22, 2005

Francis Lammes

Francis Lammes  
Reg. No. 55,353  
Yee & Associates, P.C.  
P.O. Box 802333  
Dallas, TX 75380  
(972) 385-8777  
Agent for Applicants